



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,060	07/25/2003	Sarah Mailefer	2652	4150
7590		04/13/2010		
STRIKER, STRIKER & STENBY			EXAMINER	
103 East Neck Road			VAKILI, ZOHREH	
Huntington, NY 11743			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/628,060	Applicant(s) MAILLEFER ET AL.
	Examiner ZOHREH VAKILI	Art Unit 1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2010.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 25-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 25-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION**Claims 25-32 are presented for examination.**

Applicant's Amendment filed January 6, 2010 has been received and entered into the present application. Claims 25-32 are pending and are herein examined on the merits.

Applicant's arguments, filed January 6, 2010 have been fully considered. Rejections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections presently being applied to the instant application.

Double Patenting (New Grounds of Rejection)

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Art Unit: 1614

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 25-32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of US Patent No. 6582679 B2.

An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claims because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claims.

In this case, the reference claims recite a hair wax product comprises from 3 to 20 percent by weight of an emulsifier. Wherein said emulsifier is selected from the group consisting of addition products of 2 to 30 mol ethylene oxide with fatty alcohols having 8 to 22 carbon atoms; addition products of 2 to 30 mol ethylene oxide with fatty acids containing 12 to 22 carbon atoms; addition products of 2 to 30 mol ethylene oxide with alkylphenols containing 8 to 15 carbon atoms in the alkyl groups; addition products of 1 to 5 mol propylene oxide with fatty alcohols having 8 to 22 carbon atoms; addition products of 1 to 5 mol of propylene oxide with fatty acids containing 12 to 22 carbon atoms; addition products of 1 to 5 mol propylene oxide with alkylphenols containing 8 to 15 carbon atoms in the alkyl groups; fatty acid mono- and diesters having 12 to 22 carbon atoms of addition products of 1 to 30 mol ethylene oxide with glycerol; addition products of 5 to 60 mol of ethylene oxide with castor oil; monoesters, diesters and triesters of phosphoric acid and addition products of 2 to 30 mol of

Art Unit: 1614

ethylene oxide with fatty alcohols having 8 to 22 carbon atoms; or mixtures thereof.

The components of the compositions are identical and so is its use. Such subject matter of the present claims directly conflicts with the subject matter of the reference claims and is not considered to be patentably distinct.

Thus, claims 25-32 are not considered to be patentably distinct over claims 1-19 of US Patent No. 6582679 B2, and are properly rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being obvious and unpatentable variants.

Conclusion

No claims of the present application are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Zohreh Vakili, telephone number 571-272-3099. The examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached at 571-272-0718. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

Art Unit: 1614

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zohreh Vakili

Patent Examiner

April 8, 2010

Art Unit 1614

/Ardin Marschel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614